

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above-captioned patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

By the forgoing amendments, claims 1 and 4-6 have been amended, claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled, and claim 8 has been added. Thus, claims 1 and 4-8 currently are pending and are subject to examination in the above-captioned patent application

In the Office Action mailed December 30, 2004, the Examiner objects to the title of the invention as being non-descriptive of the claimed invention. Applicants have amended the title of the invention, and submit that the new title of the invention is descriptive of the claimed invention. Therefore Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the title of the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Shinoda et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0141817 A1). The Examiner also rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by Masuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,183). Moreover, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Otani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,674,238). To the extent that these rejections remain applicable in view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants traverse these rejections, as follows.

1. Shinoda

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 as allegedly being anticipated by Shinoda. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as follows.

Applicants have canceled claim 2, without prejudice to the subject matter claimed thereby. Therefore, the anticipation rejection of claim 2 in view of Shinoda is rendered moot.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Shinoda is not a proper prior art reference in the above-captioned patent application. Specifically, the priority date of the above-captioned patent application is October 4, 2002. The United States filing date of Shinoda is November 7, 2002. Thus, the effective filing date of the above-captioned patent application predates the filing date of Shinoda. Applicants are including a verified English-language translation of the priority document in the above-referenced patent application, thereby establishing that the priority date of the above-captioned patent application is October 4, 2002. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejection of claim 1 in view of Shinoda.

## 2. Masuda

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by Masuda. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as follows.

Applicants have canceled claim 3, without prejudice to the subject matter claimed thereby. Therefore, the anticipation rejection of claim 3 in view of Masuda is rendered moot.

Moreover, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to incorporate at least some of the limitations of original claim 2, to recite, in part: a plasma display panel comprising “a black- or dark-colored light absorption layer facing the front substrate and formed in each area including the transverse walls between the unit light-emission areas

adjacent to each other in the column direction in the discharge space, wherein in between the unit light-emission areas adjacent to each other in the column direction, **the transverse walls partitioning off the corresponding unit light-emission areas are opposite each other with an interstice in between, and said light absorption layer is formed inside the interstice.** Thus, in Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in independent claim 1, the transverse walls are separated by the interstice, and the light absorption layer is formed inside the interstice.

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in independent claim 1, Masuda does not disclose or suggest that the transverse walls are separated by the interstice and the light absorption layer is formed inside the interstice. Moreover, the Examiner did not reject original claim 2 as allegedly being anticipated by Masuda. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejection of claim 1 in view of Masuda.

3. Otani

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-7 as allegedly being anticipated by Otani. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as follows.

Applicants have canceled claim 2, without prejudice to the subject matter claimed thereby. Therefore, the anticipation rejection of claim 2 in view of Masuda is rendered moot.


Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Otani is not a proper prior art reference in the above-captioned patent application. Specifically, both Otani and the above-captioned patent application are assigned to Pioneer Corporation, and both Otani

and the above-captioned patent application were commonly owned by Pioneer Corporation at the time the present invention was made. Applicants are including a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 with this responsive amendment declaring that and both Otani and the above-captioned patent application were commonly owned by Pioneer Corporation at the time the present invention was made. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejection of claims 1 and 4-7 in view of Otani.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-captioned patent application is in condition for allowance, and such an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below. Applicants are filing a Petition For a Three-Month Extension of Time with this response, and are enclosing a check in the amount of \$1,020.00 covering the requisite large entity fee for a three-month extension of time. Nevertheless, in the event of any variance between the fees determined by Applicants and those determined by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, please charge any such variance to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing Attorney Docket No. 107156.00204.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy J. Churn  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 48,340

**Customer No. 004372**

ARENT FOX, PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Telephone No. (202) 715-8434  
Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810

CMM/TJC:klf

Enclosures: Verified English-language translation of the priority document  
Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.32  
Petition for Extension of Time (3 months)